



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Two curious facts regarding the church in Wales remain to be observed: First, the church was monastic rather than episcopal; episcopacy was not territorial. In this respect the Welsh church was more like the church in the East. Second, just as proprietorship in land inclined to fall into the tribal mould, so we notice that rights of patronage in the church tend to become subject to the rules of the tribe (pp. 204, 233).

The great value of *The Tribal System in Wales* is plain. Real knowledge of one tribal system is the stepping-stone to a knowledge of others. The author's concluding words may well be used to conclude this review: "In so far as the attempt has been approximately successful to place the knowledge of the main features of one tribal system upon a solid foundation of evidence, a step at least will have been gained towards a knowledge of other tribal systems and of their place in economic history."

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON.

Feudal England: Historical Studies on the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries. By J. H. ROUND. London: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., 1896. 8vo., pp. —.

THIS work is a collection of essays, many of which have already appeared in the *English Historical Review*. The author is a free lance among historians, belonging to no recognized "School." As an independent investigator, he presents these studies with the object "either to add to or correct our existing knowledge of facts." Perhaps the most important conclusions reached are those upon the Domesday Book. A document, which has hitherto been known to a few, but has never received scientific treatment, the *Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiænsis*, is brought into comparison with the Domesday Book. The result is that the "Sacrosanct status" of the Great Survey is greatly impaired, and the Domesday instead of being an original document is shown to be like the *Inquisitio*, a transcript from the original returns which were allowed to disappear. Light is thrown on some questions which have long puzzled the student. By bringing in the testimony of different documents in parallel columns—a kind of argument in which Mr. Round is an adept, it is shown that the *caruca* and eight oxen are interchangeable; that a hide consisted of four virgates; that there were thirty acres in the virgate. A view which is quite revolutionary is

advanced, that not the Manor, or the Vill was the unit of assessment, but the Hundred. The unit of 5 hides was the basis of the Hundred, and the normal Hundred was 100 hides, but the number often was 200, 50, 25, 80, or 90 hides. In the "Danish" districts, however, the unit was the six carucates; in these parts the Hundreds were on the duodecimal system, the normal Hundred being twelve carucates. The assessments, which were primarily laid upon the Hundreds, were subdivided by the Hundreds themselves among the constituent Manors and Villis.

The debate of 1163 between Henry II. and Thomas à Becket has been understood as referring to the Danegeld, and its importance is due to the fact that it was "the first case of any express opposition being made to the king's financial dealings since the Conquest" (Stubbs). The money has been assumed to be Danegeld simply because it was an impost of two shillings on the hide. The difficulties of the case have been felt but not overcome, until the mysterious payment of two shillings for the sheriffs is designated as the *auxilium vicecomitis*, a local levy familiar enough in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Another interesting constitutional question is that of the debate on foreign service of 1197. The refusal of Hugh of Lincoln to respond to the king's demands for the war in France is called by Stubbs "a landmark in constitutional history;" and Freeman says that Hugh "spoke for the laws and rights of Englishmen." The sources, though somewhat lacking in clearness, by an impartial comparison show that Hugh stood not upon the rights of an Englishman, or of a Churchman, but upon the ground that the church of Lincoln did not owe military service—"Scio ad militare servitium domino regi, sed in hoc terra solummodo exhibendum, Lincolnensem ecclesiam teneri." Scutage is not mentioned in the refusal.

These are a few of the conclusions presented by the work of Mr. Round, and it will be seen that they are not merely matters of antiquarian curiosity, but subjects quite vital to the history of the period. The special advantages which Mr. Round's historical method possesses are twofold. First: the presentation of unpublished and often unknown documents, which fill out or correct the sources in use. The new material which the Records Office is made to furnish, renders a revision of many accepted views a necessity. Second: the absence of any preconceived theory of constitutional development. The purpose of Mr. Round is solely "to add to or correct," and he writes only on

topics where something has been left unsaid. The book, therefore, is not in any sense a history or treatise of the period. The method is purely controversial. The arguments are supported not by reasons, but by facts, and the facts for the most part are presented in cumulative form. Some of the tables collected have a special value of their own.

In point of style, there is one feature which is to be deprecated. While the method is of necessity controversial, it is not desirable that it should take an acute form. Referring to Freeman, there are such expressions as the following: "One may deem it a duty to correct the errors into which he fell, and conscientiously to combat as an obstinate and mischievous superstition, the conviction of his preëminent accuracy and authority on matters of fact" (Preface x.); and again, "in all these fantasies of a brain viewing plain facts through a mist of moots and witan, we have what can only be termed history in masquerade" (p. 538). Mr. Round claims that his opponents—that is, the supporters of Freeman—have not fought him fairly (Preface xii.). However this may be, a less egoistic form of discussion in one who is acknowledged "the ablest student of the Domesday Book," would better suit the dignity of the subject. Such repeated expressions as, "I insist upon the fact," "my discovery," "the evidence I have collected," "I take my stand as absolute proof," are in contrast to the modest objective style of Pike's *Constitutional History of the House of Lords*. But the method of scholarship exemplified in *Feudal England* cannot be too highly commended.

J. F. BALDWIN.